

2025:PHHC:073634



232.

**IN THE HIGH COURT OF PUNJAB AND HARYANA AT
CHANDIGARH**

CRM-M-28833-2025

Date of decision: 28.05.2025

Jagjit Singh

.... Petitioner

Versus

Union of India and others

.... Respondents

CORAM: HON'BLE MRS. JUSTICE MANJARI NEHRU KAUL

Present: Mr. Sahil Choudhary, Advocate, for the petitioner.

Mr. Sourabh Goel, Special Public Prosecutor, NCB,
with Ms. Samridhi Jain, Advocate, for respondent No.1.

MANJARI NEHRU KAUL, J. (ORAL)

1. Prayer in this petition filed under Section 483 of BNSS, 2023, is for grant of regular bail to the petitioner, pending trial, in case FIR No.24, dated 20.10.2023, under Sections 8, 18, 27A, 29 and 60 of NDPS Act, 1985, registered at Police Station NCB, CZU, Chandigarh.

2. Learned counsel for the petitioner submits that the petitioner has been in custody since 20.10.2023. After the challan was presented on 19.12.2023, the trial has not proceeded and has come to a virtual standstill. Hence, the petitioner cannot be made to languish in custody for no fault of his. It has been submitted that the petitioner has no previous criminal antecedents and, therefore, he be enlarged on bail.

3. Learned counsel appearing on behalf of NCB has, however, vehemently opposed the prayer and submissions made by the counsel opposite. It has been submitted that no doubt, the petitioner has been in custody since 20.10.2023 and challan was presented on 19.12.2023, however, a perusal of the zimni orders which have been annexed by none other than the petitioner as Annexure P-3 reveal an altogether different story. It is on the request of the defence counsel that charges have not yet been framed as the case is being adjourned repeatedly for advancing arguments on charge. Learned counsel for NCB has submitted that in the circumstances, the petitioner does not deserve the concession of bail on account of the alleged inordinate delay in the conclusion of trial.

4. I have heard learned counsel for the parties and perused the material placed on record, including the zimni orders.

5. A perusal of the zimni orders indeed reveals that on each and every date of hearing except for one date of hearing before the learned Trial Court, a request for adjournment had been made by none other than the counsel for the accused and it is precisely for this reason that the trial has come to a virtual standstill.

6. Accordingly, the present petition is dismissed.

7. However, the learned Trial Court would make earnest efforts not to give unnecessary adjournment to the counsel for the defence as is evident from the perusal of the zimni orders.

8. It is made clear that anything observed hereinabove shall not be construed to be an expression of opinion on the merits of the case.

(MANJARI NEHRU KAUL)
JUDGE

May 28, 2025
sanjeev

Whether speaking/reasoned:	Yes/No
Whether reportable:	Yes/No